

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
GREENEVILLE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	2:20-CR-00072-DCLC-CRW
)	
v.)	
)	
JEREMY SMALLWOOD,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court to consider the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of the United States Magistrate Judge [Doc. 230], in which the magistrate judge recommends that Defendant’s various *pro se* motions [Docs. 205, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 227] be denied. Defendant objected to the R&R [Doc. 232] and the United States (“the Government”) responded to Defendant’s objections [Doc. 233]. Pursuant to Fed.R.Crim.P. 59, “[t]he district judge must consider de novo any objection to the magistrate judge’s recommendation” and “may accept, reject, or modify the recommendation, receive further evidence, or resubmit the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.” Fed.R.Crim.P. 59(b)(3). However, the Court need not provide de novo review where objections to an R&R are “frivolous, conclusive or general.” *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).

Here, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the magistrate judge denied Defendant’s motions to compel the production of grand jury testimony and other discovery [Docs. 205, 207, 208, 210, 213, 214, 219, 220, 222, 225, 228, 229], motions for sanctions, attorney’s fees, and litigation expenses [Docs. 217, 225], motion to subpoena a phone call between Defendant and his former counsel [Doc. 218], motions to show cause and for status conference [Docs. 215, 219], motion to correct the record [Doc. 211], and motions for release pending appeal [Docs. 222, 224]. In addition to the

foregoing, the magistrate judge recommends that the Court deny the Motion to Release [Doc. 207], Motion to Dismiss Indictment [Doc. 227], and all other pending motions to the extent Defendant requests immediate release [Docs. 205, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215]. Defendant timely filed objections to the R&R [Doc. 232]. However, he does not object to any finding or recommendation of the magistrate judge. Rather, he objects to the R&R as a whole, and the remainder of his objections allege misconduct by the Assistant United States Attorney who prosecuted the case and reiterate his request for discovery, which the magistrate judge denied.

Accordingly, Defendant's objections are **OVERRULED**, and the R&R is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED**. For the reasons set on in the R&R, which are incorporated by reference herein, Defendant's motions [Docs. 205, 207, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 227] are **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED:

s/Clifton L. Corker
United States District Judge